

REMARKS

Applicant's representative would like to thank the Examiner for granting a telephone interview on January 12, 2007 in which the status of the pending application and how to best move the case forward procedurally were discussed. The Examiner is especially thanked for being particularly responsive to representative's request for assistance in how best to respond to certain Office Actions and in guiding the pending application through prosecution.

The Office Action dated June 1, 2007 states that the Applicant's previous response dated February 9, 2007 was not fully responsive to the prior Office Action in which claims 1, 4-5, 7-12 and 32-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lee* in view of *Bernardo*. Specifically, the Office Action stated that the response did not address the Section 103 rejection in that *Bernardo* was argued without any reference or argument to *Lee*, and, thus, Applicant has not argued *Lee* in view of *Bernardo*. The Office Action also points out that the Applicant has not responded to all the claims, namely the dependent claims.

Before addressing the Section 103 rejection, Applicant notes that claim 1 has been amended to correct the 35 USC § 112 rejections raised in the previous Office Action. Claim 1 is amended to recite that "a task has one or more sequences and is completed by progressing from a first panel to a second panel..." Support for the amendments can be found at page 21, lines 12-19 ("sequences") and page 21, line 20 to page 22, line 18 ("sequences" and "panels"). Support can also be found at page 26, lines 10-12 and lines 24-25 ("panel"). Claim 1 has also been amended to remove the term "user's progress" and now recites language tying or relating "context and task list component" to completing a task for the purpose of creating a Web site. Support for this amendment can be found at page 26, lines 15-20 ("task list component"). Claims 5, 32, and 35 have also been amended for further clarity.

With respect to the Section 103(a) rejection, the software architecture of claim 1 is amended to include "maintaining a context and a task list component related to completing a task for the purpose of creating a Web site." This component, as well as others, is responsible for the management of contextual information in the system. The overall goal of the user is to create a "first version" of a complete Web site. To accomplish this, the user performs a series of tasks (e.g., for an e-commerce site, a task may be completing a "Product Catalog" page or an "Order

and Payment” page), where each task has one or more sequences. These sequences are completed as the user progresses through a series of panels. The integrated platform limitation, and specifically “maintaining a context and a task list component related to completing a task for the purpose of creating a Web site,” recited in claim 1 enables a user to do this and keeps track of which sequence has been reached in the Web site creation process by maintaining a context and a task list component. The “integrated platform” limitation (the last recited limitation) of the software architecture claimed in claim 1 is not shown, taught, or suggested by *Lee*.

This deficiency of *Lee* is not cured by *Bernardo*, nor does the combination of *Lee* with *Bernardo* render the claimed invention obvious. The *Bernardo* reference teaches a tool for creating a Web site. One feature of *Bernardo* is that when modifying content, the tool uses a pre-designed workflow process. A workflow process module may be used to route the proposed content of a Web site to authorized users for their input, edits, comments, and the like. Once the content has been approved for posting, the workflow process module may post the content on the Web site. A company creating a Web site may assign various tasks for editing or checking the content to different departments. Thus, the workflow module may include routing instructions and other workflow options.

The *Bernardo* reference does not teach, show or suggest “maintaining a context and a task list component” with respect to the progressing through completing a specific task in creating the Web site. In contrast, *Bernardo* teaches a user directory, including a list or database of users (see, e.g., col. 11, lines 20-25). However, this list is not a task list component as recited in claim 1 and described in the present application. Combining the teachings of *Lee* in view of the teachings of *Bernardo* does not suggest or show this limitation.

For at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claims 4, 5, 7-12 and 32 to 36, all directly or indirectly dependent on claim 1, are not unpatentable over *Lee* in view of *Bernardo*.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or that an Examiner’s Amendment would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/Rupak Nag/

Rupak Nag
Reg. No. 37,493

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
Telephone: (612) 252-3335